

Hawaii Department of Education

Consolidated State Application *Revised* Accountability Workbook

**for State Grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and
Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110)**

REVISED May 21, 2003

**Revised based on Peer Review
Conducted March 21, 2003**

&

USDOE Conference Calls of April 7, May 16,19 & 21, 2003

Final Information

**U. S. Department of Education
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Washington, D.C. 20202**

Instructions for Completing Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

By January 31, 2003, States must complete and submit to the Department this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook. We understand that some of the critical elements for the key principles may still be under consideration and may not yet be final State policy by the January 31 due date. States that do not have final approval for some of these elements or that have not finalized a decision on these elements by January 31 should, when completing the Workbook, indicate the status of each element which is not yet official State policy and provide the anticipated date by which the proposed policy will become effective. In each of these cases, States must include a timeline of steps to complete to ensure that such elements are in place by May 1, 2003, and implemented during the 2002-2003 school year. By no later than May 1, 2003, States must submit to the Department final information for all sections of the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

Transmittal Instructions

To expedite the receipt of this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook, please send your submission via the Internet as a .doc file, pdf file, rtf or .txt file or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Send electronic submissions to conapp@ed.gov.

A State that submits only a paper submission should mail the submission by express courier to:

Celia Sims
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Ave., SW
Room 3W300
Washington, D.C. 20202-6400
(202) 401-0113

PART I: Summary of Required Elements for State Accountability Systems

Instructions

The following chart is an overview of States' implementation of the critical elements required for approval of their State accountability systems. States must provide detailed implementation information for each of these elements in Part II of this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

For each of the elements listed in the following chart, States should indicate the current implementation status in their State using the following legend:

- F:** State has a final policy, approved by all the required entities in the State (e.g., State Board of Education, State Legislature), for implementing this element in its accountability system.
- P:** State has a proposed policy for implementing this element in its accountability system, but must still receive approval by required entities in the State (e.g., State Board of Education, State Legislature).
- W:** State is still working on formulating a policy to implement this element in its accountability system.

**Summary of Implementation Status for Required Elements of
State Accountability Systems**

Status	State Accountability System Element	
Principle 1: All Schools		
F	1.1	Accountability system includes <i>all schools and districts in the state</i> .
F	1.2	Accountability system holds <i>all schools to the same criteria</i> .
F	1.3	Accountability system incorporates the <i>academic achievement standards</i> .
F	1.4	Accountability system provides <i>information in a timely manner</i> .
F	1.5	Accountability system includes <i>report cards</i> .
F	1.6	Accountability system includes <i>rewards and sanctions</i> .
Principle 2: All Students		
F	2.1	The accountability system includes <i>all students</i>
F	2.2	The accountability system has a consistent definition of <i>full academic year</i> .
F	2.3	The accountability system properly includes <i>mobile students</i> .
Principle 3: Method of AYP Determinations		
F	3.1	Accountability system expects <i>all student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs to reach proficiency by 2013-14</i> .
F	3.2	Accountability system has a method for determining whether <i>student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs made adequate yearly progress</i> .
F	3.2a	Accountability system establishes a <i>starting point</i> .
F	3.2b	Accountability system establishes <i>statewide annual measurable objectives</i> .
F	3.2c	Accountability system establishes <i>intermediate goals</i> .
Principle 4: Annual Decisions		
F	4.1	The accountability system <i>determines annually the progress</i> of schools and districts.

STATUS Legend:

F – Final state policy

P – Proposed policy, awaiting State approval

W – Working to formulate policy

Principle 5: Subgroup Accountability

F	5.1	The accountability system <i>includes all the required student subgroups</i> .
F	5.2	The accountability system holds <i>schools and LEAs accountable for the progress of student subgroups</i> .
F	5.3	The accountability system includes <i>students with disabilities</i> .
F	5.4	The accountability system includes <i>limited English proficient students</i> .
F	5.5	The State has determined the minimum number of students sufficient to yield statistically reliable information for each purpose for which disaggregated data are used.
F	5.6	The State has strategies to protect the privacy of individual students in reporting achievement results and in determining whether schools and LEAs are making adequate yearly progress on the basis of disaggregated subgroups.

Principle 6: Based on Academic Assessments

F	6.1	Accountability system is based <i>primarily on academic assessments</i> .
---	-----	---

Principle 7: Additional Indicators

F	7.1	Accountability system includes <i>graduation rate for high schools</i> .
F	7.2	Accountability system includes an <i>additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools</i> .
F	7.3	Additional indicators are valid and reliable.

Principle 8: Separate Decisions for Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics

F	8.1	Accountability system holds students, schools and districts separately accountable for <i>reading/language arts and mathematics</i> .
---	-----	---

Principle 9: System Validity and Reliability

F	9.1	Accountability system produces <i>reliable decisions</i> .
F	9.2	Accountability system produces <i>valid decisions</i> .
F	9.3	State has a plan for addressing <i>changes in assessment and student population</i> .

Principle 10: Participation Rate

F	10.1	Accountability system has a means for calculating the <i>rate of participation</i> in the statewide assessment.
F	10.2	Accountability system has a means for <i>applying the 95% assessment criteria to student subgroups and small schools</i> .

STATUS Legend:

F – Final policy
P – Proposed Policy, awaiting State approval
W– Working to formulate policy

PART II: State Response and Activities for Meeting State Accountability System Requirements

Instructions

In Part II of this Workbook, States are to provide detailed information for each of the critical elements required for State accountability systems. States should answer the questions asked about each of the critical elements in the State's accountability system. States that do not have final approval for any of these elements or that have not finalized a decision on these elements by January 31, 2003, should, when completing this section of the Workbook, indicate the status of each element that is not yet official State policy and provide the anticipated date by which the proposed policy will become effective. In each of these cases, States must include a timeline of steps to complete to ensure that such elements are in place by May 1, 2003, and implemented during the 2002-2003 school year. By no later than May 1, 2003, States must submit to the Department final information for all sections of the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

PRINCIPLE 1. A single statewide Accountability System applied to all public schools and LEAs.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.1 How does the State Accountability System include every public school and LEA in the State?</p>	<p>Every public school and LEA is required to make adequate yearly progress and is included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State has a definition of “public school” and “LEA” for AYP accountability purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State Accountability System produces AYP decisions for all public schools, including public schools with variant grade configurations (e.g., K-12), public schools that serve special populations (e.g., alternative public schools, juvenile institutions, state public schools for the blind) and public charter schools. It also holds accountable public schools with no grades assessed (e.g., K-2). 	<p>A public school or LEA is not required to make adequate yearly progress and is not included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State policy systematically excludes certain public schools and/or LEAs.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(1.1)

Every Hawaii public school is required to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and is included in the state accountability system. Section 302A-1004, Hawaii Revised Statutes (HRS) [Act 238, Session Laws of Hawaii, 2000] requires annual school “report cards” as well as a statewide summary report on school status and improvement. Both Title I and non-Title I schools are part of the state’s single accountability system.

The State has a definition of “public school” and “Local Education Agency” (LEA) for AYP accountability purposes. Section 302A-101, HRS, defines “public school” as: “Public schools’ means all academic and non-college type schools established and maintained by the department [Department of Education] in accordance with law.” The governance and administrative structure of Hawaii’s public school system is unique among the states. The Hawaii public school system is a single, unified, statewide K-12 system of schools headed by the State Superintendent and the State Board of Education. The Hawaii Department of Education is both the State Education Agency (SEA) and the district or LEA. Future notations of “LEA/SEA” in this Workbook will be a reference to the Hawaii Department of Education’s dual role of serving as both the local/district and the state agencies in a single entity.

The state accountability system produces AYP decisions for all public schools, including public schools with variant grade configurations (e.g., K-8, K-12 schools), public schools that serve special populations (e.g., juvenile correctional institutions such as Olomana School, Hawaii Center for the Deaf and Blind) and 25 public charter schools.

At present, all Hawaii public schools have at least one grade (3, 5, 8, 10) assessed under the state assessment program. Additionally, most schools meet the minimum group size threshold of 30. On the 2002 state assessment, 21 schools had a total n-count in the grades assessed of less than 30, and it is projected that of these only three schools will have less than 30 students when data are aggregated over two consecutive years. For schools with fewer than 30 students enrolled, when pooled across all grades assessed, we will aggregate data over two consecutive years (or more, if necessary) in order to meet the minimum group size requirement. If the minimum n-count requirement is not met in a given year even with multi-year aggregation of school-wide data, the AYP determination is still made using the regular AYP model. In such cases, the reported AYP results will include a statement indicating that the results may be unreliable due to the small number of students enrolled in the school available for analysis.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.2 How are all public schools and LEAs held to the same criteria when making an AYP determination?	<p>All public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of the same criteria when making an AYP determination.</p> <p>If applicable, the AYP definition is integrated into the State Accountability System.</p>	Some public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of alternate criteria when making an AYP determination.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>(1.2) All public schools and the LEA/SEA are systematically judged on the basis of the same criteria when making AYP determinations. The Hawaii Department of Education's definition of AYP establishes baselines or starting points using 2002 data for all schools. All schools are expected to attain annual progress resulting in proficiency among 100% of students in reading and mathematics by 2013-14. (Please see responses to Critical Elements 3.1, 3.2, 3.2a, 3.2b, and 3.2c below for details about the Hawaii's AYP criteria and the method of making AYP determinations.)</p> <p>The AYP definition is integrated into Hawaii's school accountability system.</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.3 Does the State have, at a minimum, a definition of <i>basic</i>, <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> student achievement levels in reading/language arts and mathematics?</p>	<p>State has defined three levels of student achievement: <i>basic</i>, <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i>.¹</p> <p>Student achievement levels of <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> determine how well students are mastering the materials in the State's academic content standards; and the <i>basic</i> level of achievement provides complete information about the progress of lower-achieving students toward mastering the <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> levels.</p>	<p>Standards do not meet the legislated requirements.</p>

¹ System of State achievement standards will be reviewed by the Standards and Assessments Peer Review. The Accountability Peer Review will determine that achievement levels are used in determining AYP.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(1.3)

The accountability system is based primarily on the *HCPS II State Assessment* results in reading and mathematics. The assessment is a custom-designed assessment program to measure student achievement of the Hawaii Content and Performance Standards (HPCS). While the norm-referenced Stanford Achievement Tests, 9th Edition, Abbreviated (SAT-9), are a part of the state assessment program as required by State Board of Education Policy #2520, it is important to note that the assessment results used in the accountability system are the standards-based scores from the standards-based sections of the assessment, not SAT-9 scores. Hawaii has defined four levels of proficiency for the standards-based segments of the *HCPS II State Assessment* in reading and mathematics as follows:

Level 1. Well Below Proficiency

Assessment results indicate that the student has demonstrated little or no knowledge and skills in the content standards for this grade.

Level 2. Approaches Proficiency

Assessment results indicate that the student has demonstrated some knowledge and skills in the content standards for this grade. With more support and effort, the student should be able to reach the proficient level.

Level 3. Meets Proficiency

Assessment results indicate that the student has demonstrated the knowledge and skills required to meet the content standards for this grade. The student is ready to work on higher levels of this content area.

Level 4. Exceeds Proficiency

Assessment results indicate that the student has demonstrated knowledge and skills that exceed the content standards for this grade. The student is ready for more advanced work in the content area.

The student achievement levels of "Meets Proficiency" (*proficient*) and "Exceeds Proficiency" (*advanced*) determine how well students are mastering the State's academic content standards; and the "Well Below Proficiency" and "Approaches Proficiency" (*basic*) levels of achievement provide information about the progress of lower-achieving students toward mastering the *proficient* and *advanced* levels. For purposes of calculating AYP and reporting AYP, the Meets Proficiency and Exceed Proficiency levels will be considered "proficient" and the Approaches Proficiency and Well Below Proficiency levels will be considered "not proficient." The "proficient" level (Meets Proficiency plus Exceeds Proficiency) is the goal for all Hawaii students and it is the level used for making AYP decisions.

At its November 7, 2002 meeting, the State Board of Education established "cut-points" for the standards-based reading and mathematics scales for all grades tested (3, 5, 8, and 10). Applying these cut-points to preliminary 2002 assessment results shows the approximate distribution of students:

Reading: 61% Not Proficient and 39% Proficient
Mathematics: 81% Not Proficient and 19% Proficient

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.4 How does the State provide accountability and adequate yearly progress decisions and information in a timely manner?	<p>State provides decisions about adequate yearly progress in time for LEAs to implement the required provisions before the beginning of the next academic year.</p> <p>State allows enough time to notify parents about public school choice or supplemental educational service options, time for parents to make an informed decision, and time to implement public school choice and supplemental educational services.</p>	Timeline does not provide sufficient time for LEAs to fulfill their responsibilities before the beginning of the next academic year.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(1.4)

The *HCPS II State Assessment* is administered in the spring (March and April in 2003) to permit assessment of an almost full year of student attainment at the tested grade level. Tests include essay, constructed response and multiple-choice items. The test publisher scores the assessments off island. The timeline for reporting assessment results to schools, parents and the public has been accelerated over past years by more than 60 days, from October or later to early August.

Beginning in 2003, the Hawaii Department of Education will render preliminary AYP determinations and notify schools of those determinations before the end of August of each year. We will require schools, upon receipt of this notice, to notify the parents of all students who are assigned to a school that has been preliminarily identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring of their school choice option. Parent notification will, under this plan, take place no later than the first week of September.

Hawaii is grappling with how to define "beginning of the academic year." While the traditional or "regular" academic year begins in the third week of August and ends the second week of June, Hawaii, however, also has over 80% of schools operating under School/Community-Based Management that have modified school calendars that resemble single-track year-round schools. Their academic year may **begin** as early as the first week of July and **end** as late as the last week of July. Thus, some schools are already beginning a new academic year while others are still in session for the previous one. Even if data were available instantly after the close of a school's academic year, some other schools would have already begun the subsequent year.

Final school and LEA/SEA accountability reports and AYP determinations will be issued within 40 days after test results are returned. The 40-day timeframe is necessary to accommodate the school-level appeals process. (See Critical Element 9.2 for details.) Once final AYP determinations are issued we will revise the list of schools identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring to reflect any additions or deletions resulting from analysis of the final determinations. Schools, upon receipt of final accountability results, will notify parents and make mid-year choice available in any cases where the preliminary AYP finding did not identify them as needing improvement, corrective action or restructuring. In cases where the reverse is true, if a school that was preliminarily identified does not appear on the final list of schools identified for improvement, it will be so informed and relieved of prospective requirements. Any school choice commitments (i.e., transportation costs) that were made based on the preliminary identification will be honored for the balance of the school year.

The LEA/SEA will require schools to offer public school choice to students enrolled in first year school improvement schools and to provide public school choice and supplementary services and take intervening actions appropriate to the number of years of school improvement or corrective action. The established timelines are consistent with NCLB.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.5 Does the State Accountability System produce an annual State Report Card?</p>	<p>The State Report Card includes all the required data elements [see Appendix A for the list of required data elements].</p> <p>The State Report Card is available to the public at the beginning of the academic year.</p> <p>The State Report Card is accessible in languages of major populations in the State, to the extent possible.</p> <p>Assessment results and other academic indicators (including graduation rates) are reported by student subgroups</p>	<p>The State Report Card does not include all the required data elements.</p> <p>The State Report Card is not available to the public.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(1.5)

The state accountability report card and school report cards for each public school in the state are produced and published electronically. The report cards currently include each of the data elements required by section 1111(h)(1)(C) of PL 107-110 except the counts and percentages of secondary school classes taught by "other than highly qualified" teachers. That element will be added as soon as it is technically possible to do so. (See below.) The state will publish the annual state report card at the earliest possible date. Currently, Hawaii is grappling with how to define "beginning of the academic year." There are three reasons for this that cannot be surmounted by legislative or administrative order:

1. While the "regular" academic year begins in the third week of August and ends the second week of June, individual schools, operating under School/Community-Based Management, have academic years that **begin** as early as the first week of July and **end** as late as the last week of July. Thus, some schools are already beginning a new academic year while others are still in session for the previous one. Even if data were available instantly after the close of a school's academic year, some other schools would have already begun the subsequent year.
2. To be calculated accurately, the retention rate for elementary and middle school students (selected by the Hawaii Department of Education as the third indicator required by PL107-110), requires the enrolled grade level for each target student at the beginning of the subsequent academic year. Those data are obtained from the official enrollment count student rosters, which are created at the end of the second week of school. Any other data used for calculating retention rates would be subject to unacceptable rates of error. Likewise the graduation rate (which is a true graduation rate, based on tracking individual students over four years), requires accurate identification of each student's status at the end of the senior academic year. Those data are only available after the close of the academic year and the receipt of students' final grades.
3. The scoring and processing of the assessments are done by a testing contractor, which must score both multiple choice and constructed response items, match multiple choice and constructed response scores, match reading, writing, and mathematics subscales, and ensure that all students tested are correctly identified. This processing can require substantial manual processing. The Hawaii Department of Education and the contractor have moved up the start of statewide testing from April to March to complete processing by August 1.

The state is currently developing an interim survey system to gather the data necessary to calculate accurate counts of secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully qualified for the level and subject matter involved. The school survey data for the 2002-03 school year will have been retrieved by May 30, 2003 and will be included in the publication of the 2002-03 report cards. Meanwhile the Hawaii Department of Education is also evaluating proposals from vendors for a new, system-wide student information system. That student information system is expected to provide complete data on all students in all public schools on a real-time basis. When the new system is installed, the state will have the capability of processing student data without having to transfer data manually from individual school computers to the central data system, as is required by the current data system. At that time, the state will be able to prepare the school accountability reports by the "beginning of the academic year."

Downloadable, print-ready versions of LEA/SEA and school report cards for the 2001-02 school year have been produced. The reports are accessible via the Assessment Resource Center Hawaii website at <http://arch.k12.hi.us>.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.6 How does the State Accountability System include rewards and sanctions for public schools and LEAs? ²	<p>State uses one or more types of rewards and sanctions, where the criteria are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set by the State; • Based on adequate yearly progress decisions; and, • Applied uniformly across public schools and LEAs. 	State does not implement rewards or sanctions for public schools and LEAs based on adequate yearly progress.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>(1.6) Hawaii uses one or more types of rewards and sanctions, where the criteria are applied uniformly across all public schools and the LEA/SEA.</p> <p>Per the requirements of NCLB, sanctions and interventions will be imposed by the LEA/SEA on all public schools through its single accountability system.</p> <p>In Hawaii, both Title I and non-Title I schools are subject to the specific sanctions required by section 1116 of the NCLB law. Under NCLB, the State plans to recognize public schools as high performing that meet or exceed all State standards and achieve AYP for all applicable disaggregated groups of students. The State plans to recognize rapidly improving public schools that have made AYP for all applicable disaggregated groups of students for three consecutive years. Schools that fail to make Adequate Yearly Progress will be subject to improvement and corrective action</p> <p>Academic achievement will be recognized by two programs: the national <i>No Child Left Behind Blue Ribbon Schools Program</i> and <i>Hawaii's Distinguished Schools Program</i>. All public elementary and secondary schools that meet the stringent criteria of the <i>No Child Left Behind Blue Ribbon Schools Program</i> will be honored as schools that have made significant progress in closing the achievement gap or whose students achieve at very high levels. The <i>Hawaii's Distinguished Schools Program</i> is a revision of a previous statewide public school recognition program.</p>		

² The state must provide rewards and sanctions for all public schools and LEAs for making adequate yearly progress, except that the State is not required to hold schools and LEAs not receiving Title I funds to the requirements of section 1116 of NCLB [§200.12(b)(40)].

PRINCIPLE 2. All students are included in the State Accountability System.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
2.1 How does the State Accountability System include all students in the State?	<p>All students in the State are included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>The definitions of “public school” and “LEA” account for all students enrolled in the public school district, regardless of program or type of public school.</p>	Public school students exist in the State for whom the State Accountability System makes no provision.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>(2.1) The definitions of “public school” and “LEA” account for all public school students enrolled in the LEA/SEA, regardless of program or type of public school. (See Critical Element 1.1, “How does the State Accountability System include every public school and LEA in the State?”)</p> <p>Beginning in 2003 all students enrolled at the time of testing are expected to participate in <i>HCPS II State Assessment</i>. The first Monday in the month of March will be used as a fixed census date for determining the specific students for whom a given school is responsible in terms of ensuring participation in the state assessment. That census will operationally define “enrolled at the time of testing” and will comprise the denominator of the assessment participation rate measure used in determining AYP for the state, for schools, and for all required student subgroups. (See Critical Elements 2.2, 2.3 and 10.1 for related details.)</p> <p>Make up sessions are given for students absent from school on scheduled testing dates. Alternate Assessment results are included in the school and LEA/SEA determination of AYP. Although students with disabilities and limited English proficient students may receive certain testing accommodations or modifications, no students are exempted from the assessment or accountability systems. (See Critical Element 5.3, “How are students with disabilities included in the State’s definition of adequate yearly progress?” and Critical Element 5.4, “How are students with limited English proficiency included in the State’s definition of adequate yearly progress?”)</p> <p>The state assessment program’s “Student Participation Information” guide (Department of Education, Planning & Evaluation Office, Test Development Section) is designed “to provide all Department of Education personnel at the school, district, and state level with information regarding the <i>Hawaii Content and Performance Standards, Second Edition (HCPS II) State Assessment</i> participation criteria for various student populations.” The guide is updated annually and distributed via memorandum from the State Superintendent to school and support staff. Adherence to the guide is required by administrative directive. Guidelines require that all students must participate in the state assessment program. Assessment administration guides and training activities, together with stringent testing administration procedures, assure compliance with these requirements.</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
2.2 How does the State define “full academic year” for identifying students in AYP decisions?	<p>The State has a definition of “full academic year” for determining which students are to be included in decisions about AYP.</p> <p>The definition of full academic year is consistent and applied statewide.</p>	<p>LEAs have varying definitions of “full academic year.”</p> <p>The State’s definition excludes students who must transfer from one district to another as they advance to the next grade.</p> <p>The definition of full academic year is not applied consistently.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>(2.2)</p> <p>The definition of full academic year is consistent and applied statewide. “Full academic year” is defined as continuous enrollment from the beginning date of one state assessment administration to the beginning date of the next annual administration (e.g., March 3, 2003 to March 1, 2004). A full academic year will comprise no more than 365 days. A student attending the same school from the one test administration period to the next annual statewide test administration, i.e., for a full academic year, will be included when determining if the school has made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) on the academic achievement proficiency measures. A student attending more than one public school in the state (LEA/SEA) during the full academic year will be included when determining whether the LEA/SEA has made AYP on the academic achievement proficiency measures.</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>2.3 How does the State Accountability System determine which students have attended the same public school and/or LEA for a full academic year?</p>	<p>State holds public schools accountable for students who were enrolled at the same public school for a full academic year.</p> <p>State holds LEAs accountable for students who transfer during the full academic year from one public school within the district to another public school within the district.</p>	<p>State definition requires students to attend the same public school for more than a full academic year to be included in public school accountability.</p> <p>State definition requires students to attend school in the same district for more than a full academic year to be included in district accountability.</p> <p>State holds public schools accountable for students who have not attended the same public school for a full academic year.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>(2.3)</p> <p>The state holds public schools accountable for students who were enrolled at the same public school for a full academic year. The student data elements used to determine which students have attended the same public school or LEA/SEA for a full academic year are collected in the statewide Student Information System. The statewide data system includes a unique student identifier that enables the Hawaii Department of Education to account for individual student enrollment and mobility.</p> <p>Students who transfer during the full academic year from one public school to another public school within the state are attributed to the LEA/SEA for the purposes of computing AYP and reporting.</p>		

PRINCIPLE 3. State definition of AYP is based on expectations for growth in student achievement that is continuous and substantial, such that all students are proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics no later than 2013-2014.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.1 How does the State's definition of adequate yearly progress require all students to be proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by the 2013-2014 academic year?	The State has a timeline for ensuring that all students will meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement in reading/language arts ³ and mathematics, not later than 2013-2014.	State definition does not require all students to achieve proficiency by 2013-2014. State extends the timeline past the 2013-2014 academic year.

³ If the state has separate assessments to cover its language arts standards (e.g., reading and writing), the State must create a method to include scores from all the relevant assessments.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(3.1)

The State's timeline for AYP ensures that all students will meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement (i.e., Meets Proficiency or Exceeds Proficiency) in reading and mathematics, no later than 2013-14.

Starting points, intermediate goals, and annual measurable objectives were set separately for reading and mathematics. Using 2002 state assessment data, baselines were established using the percent of students in the school ranked at the 20th percentile of enrollment. The 20th percentile method provided higher values (i.e., 30% for reading and 10% for mathematics) than the method based on the percent of students proficient in the lowest achieving subgroup (i.e., 6% proficient in reading among students with disabilities and 2% proficient in mathematics for students with disabilities). As required by NCLB, the higher values of the two methods were adopted as the AYP starting points or baseline values. The following tables provide Hawaii's starting points, intermediate goals, and annual measurable objectives. Hawaii's definition of Adequate Yearly Progress results in all students meeting or exceeding the proficient level of academic achievement in reading and mathematics no later than 2013-14.

Reading, Percent of Students Proficient (Grades 3, 5, 8, 10)

Year	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Baseline	30												
Inter. Goal	(30)			44			58			72		86	100
Annual Objective	(30)	30	30	44	44	44	58	58	58	72	72	86	100

Mathematics, Percent of Students Proficient (Grades 3, 5, 8, 10)

Year	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Baseline	10												
Inter. Goal	(10)			28			46			64		82	100
Annual Objective	(10)	10	10	28	28	28	46	46	46	64	64	82	100

To meet the expectations represented by these intermediate goals and annual measurable objectives, schools and districts must make substantial and continuous improvement.

The annual measurable objectives for the 2013–14 academic year require that 100 percent of students reach the proficient levels of performance in reading and mathematics.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.2 How does the State Accountability System determine whether each student subgroup, public school and LEA makes AYP?</p>	<p>For a public school and LEA to make adequate yearly progress, each student subgroup must meet or exceed the State annual measurable objectives, each student subgroup must have at least a 95% participation rate in the statewide assessments, and the school must meet the State's requirement for other academic indicators.</p> <p>However, if in any particular year the student subgroup does not meet those annual measurable objectives, the public school or LEA may be considered to have made AYP, if the percentage of students in that group who did not meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State assessments for that year decreased by 10% of that percentage from the preceding public school year; that group made progress on one or more of the State's academic indicators; and that group had at least 95% participation rate on the statewide assessment.</p>	<p>State uses different method for calculating how public schools and LEAs make AYP.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(3.2)

In determining whether each subgroup, school, as well as the LEA/SEA overall meet the annual measurable objectives, Hawaii will compute participation rates, calculate the percent of students who achieve the proficient level or higher, implement a uniform averaging procedure, and employ the safe harbor provision.

- *Participation requirements* – Schools in which at least 95 percent of the students enrolled at the time of the test take the state assessments will meet the AYP standard for participation in the state assessment. Schools in which less than 95 percent of any student subgroup takes the state assessment will not meet the AYP standard for assessment participation, provided the size of the subgroup meets the minimum number required for making inferences about participation (40 students). (See Critical Element 5.5 for the rationales for the minimum number of students sufficient to yield statistically reliable information for each purpose for which data are used.) If the size of the subgroup is less than 40 students, then a participation rate of less than 95 percent for that subgroup will not result in a failure to meet the AYP participation standard. Participation requirements will be applied in the same way when determining whether the LEA/SEA as a whole met the AYP standard for participation in the state assessment. Participation requirements are applied separately for reading and mathematics.
- *Uniform averaging procedure* – Averaging pertains to both grade levels and years.

Grade levels

Hawaii will pool or combine (which is equivalent to averaging) the percent proficient across grades within a school building and the LEA/SEA to determine AYP. The percent proficient will be calculated based on the number of tested students that were enrolled for a full academic year. AYP will be determined separately for reading and mathematics.

Years

In addition, Hawaii will average the most recent two years of test scores (including the current year's scores) and compare the results to the current year's test scores. The highest percent proficient will be used to determine the school's and the LEA's/SEA's AYP status. This approach rewards schools for efforts that result in strong single-year achievement gains and minimizes the potential for falsely inferring that a school building or the LEA/SEA has failed to make AYP. Since the 2001-02 school year was the first time that Hawaii's *HCPS II State Assessment* was administered, averaging across years will be implemented following the 2002-03 administration of the state assessment.

- *Safe harbor provision* – If one or more subgroups within a school or the LEA/SEA, or if a school or the LEA/SEA as a whole fail to meet the annual measurable proficiency objective, then the subgroup, school, or LEA/SEA still makes Adequate Yearly Progress if *both* of these conditions are met:

(a) The percentage of students in the subgroup, school, or LEA/SEA who are **not proficient** decreases (improves) by at least 10% from the preceding year.

In calculating the percentage decrease, Hawaii will compute the difference of the current year's average percent not proficient and the preceding year's average percent not proficient to determine whether the subgroup, school, or LEA/SEA achieved the criterion of a 10% reduction. Since the 2001-02 school year was the first time that Hawaii's current state assessment was administered, averaging across years for the safe harbor provision will be implemented following the 2003-04 assessment administration. Until then, safe harbor will be computed as a simple

difference of the current to prior year's percent not proficient.

AND

(b) The students in that subgroup, school, or the LEA/SEA meet the annual measurable objective for the other academic indicator (i.e., retention rate for elementary and middle/intermediate schools or graduation rate for high schools).

AYP will be determined using 2002 data as the baseline. The starting points are calculated pursuant to the NCLB law and rule requirements. The same starting point and annual, measurable goals apply to all student subpopulations resulting in 100% proficiency of all students by 2013-14.

The method used for determining whether each student subgroup, public school, and the LEA/SEA make AYP is summarized below. The method is applied separately to reading and to mathematics. Data are pooled across all grade levels in the school or LEA/SEA. The sequence of steps used in determining AYP is important.

1. Calculate the n-count for the subgroup (or aggregate group, i.e., school or LEA/SEA) and compare the value to the minimum n criterion of 30 for making inferences about student proficiency. (See Critical Element 5.5.) If the n-count is smaller than the minimum n criterion for making inferences about student proficiency (30), the subgroup is not used in determining AYP. Otherwise, continue to Step 2.

Note: All subgroups at the school level, whether with an n-count too small to count toward AYP or not, are "rolled up" into the overall, aggregate school proficiency scores.

Note: For those few unique schools for which the total number of students enrolled in all the assessed grade levels is fewer than the minimum n-count, assessment data for the school is aggregated (as noted in Critical Element 1.1) over two consecutive years or more, if necessary, in order to meet the minimum n-size requirement. If the minimum n-count requirement is not met in a given year even with multi-year aggregation of school-wide data, the AYP determination is still made using the regular AYP model. In such cases, the reported AYP results will include a statement indicating that the results may be unreliable due to the small number of students enrolled in the school available for analysis.

2. Compute the percent of proficient students for the subgroup (or aggregate group, i.e., school or LEA/SEA) using the current year's test scores and the average of the two most recent year's scores (including the current year). If either or both computed percents proficient is equal to or greater than the established annual measurable objective, then AYP is met. Otherwise, AYP may not have been met, the final determination of which is subject to the "safe harbor provision" implemented in Step 3.
3. If the subgroup (or aggregate group, i.e., school or LEA/SEA) did not meet AYP under Step 2, then the specific requirements of the "safe harbor provision," as stipulated above, are invoked. If both conditions of the safe harbor provision are satisfied, then AYP for proficiency of the subgroup is met. Otherwise, AYP is not met.

Note: In determining the percentage decrease in the percent of students not proficient, data used for the computation from the preceding year(s) may not satisfy the minimum n-count requirements for making inferences about subgroup proficiency. In that situation, the safe harbor computation will still be made but associated AYP results will include a statement indicating that the results may be unreliable due to the small number of students available for analysis.

4. Calculate the assessment participation rate for the subgroup (or aggregate group, i.e., school or LEA/SEA) in accordance to the "participation requirements" stipulated above. (See also Critical Element 10.1 for related details.) Compare the participation rate calculated to the minimum n

criterion of 40 for making inferences about student participation. (See Critical Element 5.5.) If the n-count is smaller than the minimum n criterion for making inferences about student participation (40), the subgroup is not used in determining AYP for participation rate. Otherwise, continue to Step 5.

5. Compare the calculated assessment participation rate to the 95% criterion. If the calculated assessment participation rate is equal to or greater than 95%, then AYP is met rate for the subgroup (or aggregate group, i.e., school or LEA/SEA). Otherwise, AYP is not met.
6. For the other required AYP indicators (i.e., graduation rate for high schools and retention rate for elementary and middle/intermediate schools), determine at the aggregate level of school or LEA/SEA, as appropriate, if the measurable annual target has been met. If the computed graduation or retention rate is equal to or greater than the specified annual target value, then the measurable annual target is met. If the annual measurable target is met, AYP is met. Otherwise, AYP is not met.

Note: Disaggregation by subgroups is not necessary for purposes of determining AYP for the other required indicators. Only aggregate school-wide (and LEA/SEA level) values are needed. However, disaggregated subgroup data for the other required indicators is necessary for use in implementing the safe harbor provision in Step 3.

Failure to make AYP for two consecutive years -- defined as failure of ANY subgroup (or aggregate group, i.e., school or LEA/SEA, if applicable) to not meet AYP in the SAME content area (i.e., reading or mathematics) – will result in the school (or LEA/SEA) being identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring as specified in NCLB.

[Note: Upon the recommendation of the U.S. Department of Education's Peer Review of March 21, 2003, given their review of Hawaii's draft Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook dated January 31, 2003, the Hawaii Department of Education has modified its proposed approach to invoking accountability sanctions which had, in Hawaii's January 31, 2003 draft workbook, required failure of the same subgroup in the same content area for two consecutive years. While undocumented in regulations or non-regulatory guidance, a bar to invoking "same subgroup" is apparently a policy decision by the U.S. Secretary of Education. The Hawaii Department of Education respectfully suggests that eliminating "same subgroup" weakens the consequential validity of the NCLB accountability design, its perceived fairness, and will present serious and potentially unfeasible challenges to providing sufficient support and assistance to large numbers of under-performing schools. Nonetheless, as should be noted from the preceding paragraph, we will comply with the "any subgroup" requirement.]

For any school (or the LEA/SEA) to exit from improvement, corrective action, or planning for restructuring, it must meet AYP for two consecutive years.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.2a What is the State's starting point for calculating Adequate Yearly Progress?</p>	<p>Using data from the 2001-2002 school year, the State established separate starting points in reading/language arts and mathematics for measuring the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the State's proficient level of academic achievement.</p> <p>Each starting point is based, at a minimum, on the higher of the following percentages of students at the proficient level: (1) the percentage in the State of proficient students in the lowest-achieving student subgroup; or, (2) the percentage of proficient students in a public school at the 20th percentile of the State's total enrollment among all schools ranked by the percentage of students at the proficient level.</p> <p>A State may use these procedures to establish separate starting points by grade span; however, the starting point must be the same for all like schools (e.g., one same starting point for all elementary schools, one same starting point for all middle schools...).</p>	<p>The State Accountability System uses a different method for calculating the starting point (or baseline data).</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(3.2a)

NCLB requires that “data for the 2001-2002 school year” shall be used to define the starting point for the accountability system. Using data from the 2001-02 school year, Hawaii established separate starting points in reading and mathematics for measuring the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the State’s proficient level of academic achievement. The tables included in our response to Critical Element 3.1 show the starting point values established for each assessment.

We calculated our starting points for reading and math using NCLB-prescribed methodology. According to NCLB, the starting points for reading and for mathematics are to be based on the higher of the following percentages of students at the proficient level: (1) the percentage in the State of proficient students in the lowest-achieving student subgroup; or, (2) the percentage of proficient students in a public school at the 20th percentile of the State’s total enrollment among all schools ranked by the percentage of students at the proficient level.

The State used the required procedures to establish a common starting point for all grade levels assessed. The starting points for reading and for mathematics are the same for all schools and all student subgroups. The 20th percentile method provided higher values (i.e., 30% for reading and 10% for mathematics) than the method based on the percent of students proficient in the lowest achieving subgroup (i.e., 6% proficient in reading among students with disabilities and 2% proficient in mathematics for students with disabilities). As required by NCLB, the higher values of the two methods were adopted as the AYP starting points or baseline values: 30% for reading, 10% for mathematics. A report of the methodology and results for setting the starting points was accepted by the Hawaii State Board of Education at their March 6, 2003 meeting and is published on the web at <http://arch.k12.hi.us>.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.2b What are the State's annual measurable objectives for determining adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>State has annual measurable objectives that are consistent with a state's intermediate goals and that identify for each year a minimum percentage of students who must meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State's academic assessments.</p> <p>The State's annual measurable objectives ensure that all students meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement within the timeline.</p> <p>The State's annual measurable objectives are the same throughout the State for each public school, each LEA, and each subgroup of students.</p>	<p>The State Accountability System uses another method for calculating annual measurable objectives.</p> <p>The State Accountability System does not include annual measurable objectives.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(3.2b)

The values for Hawaii's annual measurable objectives are given above in our response to Critical Element 3.1. Hawaii established annual measurable objectives that are consistent with the State's intermediate goals and that identify for each year a minimum percentage of students who must meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State's academic assessments. Hawaii established separate reading and mathematics statewide annual measurable objectives, uniform for all grades assessed, among which assessment data were pooled or combined, that identify a minimum percentage of students that must meet the proficient level of academic achievement. Between intermediate goals, annual measurable objectives utilize the same percent proficient as the most recent intermediate goal.

The reading and mathematics annual measurable objectives are applied to each school, as well as to each subgroup at the school and LEA/SEA levels, to determine AYP status. When determining the results statewide and for schools with multiple levels, as well as for subgroups within them, each annual measurable objective is applied to all grades assessed separately for reading and mathematics.

The State's annual measurable objectives ensure that all students meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement within the timeline.

The State's annual measurable objectives are the same throughout the State for each public school, each subgroup of students, and for the LEA/SEA.

A report of the methodology and results for setting the annual measurable objectives was accepted by the Hawaii State Board of Education at their March 6, 2003 meeting and is published on the web at <http://arch.k12.hi.us>.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.2c What are the State's intermediate goals for determining adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>State has established intermediate goals that increase in equal increments over the period covered by the State timeline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The first incremental increase takes effect not later than the 2004-2005 academic year. •Each following incremental increase occurs within three years. 	<p>The State uses another method for calculating intermediate goals.</p> <p>The State does not include intermediate goals in its definition of adequate yearly progress.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>(3.2c) Please see our response to Critical Element 3.1 above. The first incremental increase takes effect in the 2004-05 school year. Each following incremental increase occurs within three years.</p> <p>A report of the methodology and results for setting the intermediate goals was accepted by the Hawaii State Board of Education at their March 6, 2003 meeting and is published on the web at http://arch.k12.hi.us.</p>		

PRINCIPLE 4. State makes annual decisions about the achievement of all public schools and LEAs.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
4.1 How does the State Accountability System make an annual determination of whether each public school and LEA in the State made AYP?	AYP decisions for each public school and LEA are made annually. ⁴	AYP decisions for public schools and LEAs are not made annually.

⁴ Decisions may be based upon several years of data and data may be averaged across grades within a public school [§1111(b)(2)(J)].

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(4.1)

AYP decisions for each public school and the LEA/SEA are made annually.

Failure to make AYP for two consecutive years -- defined as failure of ANY subgroup (or aggregate group, i.e., school or LEA/SEA, if applicable) to not make AYP in the SAME content area (i.e., reading or mathematics) -- will result in the school (or LEA/SEA) being identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring as specified in NCLB. This approach is consistent with *No Child Left Behind's* goal of successfully remediating subject performance deficiencies and will mitigate the potential for falsely inferring that a school or LEA/SEA is not meeting AYP standards. Please see our responses to Critical Elements 3.1 and 3.2 for a description of the procedures on how AYP decisions are determined annually for each required subgroup, public school, and for the LEA/SEA.

The following school-level **example** illustrates implementation of the procedures:

Year 1 – one or more subgroups miss the AYP **reading** target (i.e., measurable annual objective) – all other AYP targets are met

Year 2 – one or more subgroups miss the AYP **reading** target – all other AYP targets are met – the school is now in improvement and must offer public school choice

Year 3 – one or more subgroups miss the AYP **reading** target – all other AYP targets are met – the school continues in improvement status and must offer public school choice *and* supplemental services

Year 4 – one or more subgroups miss the AYP **mathematics** target – all other targets met – school remains in improvement status and must continue to offer public school choice and supplemental services

Year 5 – there are two possible scenarios:

- a) one or more subgroups miss the AYP **mathematics** target (and either miss or meet the AYP reading target) – the school is now in corrective action
- b) all subgroups meet the AYP **mathematics** target (and either miss or meet the AYP reading target) – school remains in improvement status and must continue to offer public school choice and supplemental services

PRINCIPLE 5. All public schools and LEAs are held accountable for the achievement of individual subgroups.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>5.1 How does the definition of adequate yearly progress include all the required student subgroups?</p>	<p>Identifies subgroups for defining adequate yearly progress: economically disadvantaged, major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and students with limited English proficiency.</p> <p>Provides definition and data source of subgroups for adequate yearly progress.</p>	<p>State does not disaggregate data by each required student subgroup.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>(5.1)</p> <p>Subgroups used in determining Adequate Yearly Progress include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economically disadvantaged • Major racial and ethnic groups – American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, Black, White, Hispanic • Students with disabilities, and • Students with limited English proficiency. <p>The inclusion of all required student subgroups in the determination of Adequate Yearly Progress will be ensured by the state's use of the same complete student roster file for determination of relevant group membership that is used by the state to determine students' eligibility for participation in the statewide assessment. This roster identifies each student's race or ethnicity, status as economically disadvantaged or not, special education status, English proficiency status, gender, and status as a migrant student or not.</p> <p>Race or ethnicity and gender are recorded in the student roster by schools at the time of students' initial enrollment (via Form SIS-10). Economic disadvantage is identified annually through determination of eligibility for free or reduced cost school lunch. Students from families receiving public assistance are identified directly by the state Department of Human Services. Special education status is drawn from the department's special education database system. Limited English proficiency is denoted in the records when a child is referred for English for Second Language Learner program services. And status as a migrant student is obtained annually from the department's office for migrant student services.</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.2 How are public schools and LEAs held accountable for the progress of student subgroups in the determination of adequate yearly progress?	Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for student subgroup achievement: economically disadvantaged, major ethnic and racial groups, students with disabilities, and limited English proficient students.	State does not include student subgroups in its State Accountability System.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>(5.2)</p> <p>All public schools and the LEA/SEA are held accountable for student subgroup achievement -- economically disadvantaged, major ethnic and racial groups, students with disabilities, and limited English proficient students – through the AYP determination, provided the subgroup meets the minimum group size requirement. From our Student Information System and state assessment databases we are able to match student demographic data with test results and tabulate results for all required subgroups. For each subgroup and school, AYP determinations will be issued using the same reporting rules used to determine AYP for students in the aggregate at the LEA/SEA level. For each school and the LEA/SEA, the State will determine for each group of sufficient size whether the group achieved the annual measurable objective or satisfied the safe harbor provision of NCLB and met the 95% participation rate criteria.</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.3 How are students with disabilities included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?	<p>All students with disabilities participate in statewide assessments: general assessments with or without accommodations or an alternate assessment based on grade level standards for the grade in which students are enrolled.</p> <p>State demonstrates that students with disabilities are fully included in the State Accountability System.</p>	<p>The State Accountability System or State policy excludes students with disabilities from participating in the statewide assessments.</p> <p>State cannot demonstrate that alternate assessments measure grade-level standards for the grade in which students are enrolled.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(5.3)

All students with disabilities participate in statewide assessments: general assessments with or without accommodations or an alternate assessment based on grade-level standards for the grade in which the students are enrolled.

All special education students currently enrolled in grades 3,5,8, and 10 must take the *HCPS II State Assessment* or the Alternate Assessment. If required by the student's Individualized Education Plan (IEP), special education students may take the regular *HCPS II State Assessment* with accommodations. Twenty-one different accommodations are provided (for the spring 2003 administration), e.g., accommodations in presentation format, response format, setting, use of assistive technology, and the like.

The Alternate Assessment is a standards-based, IEP-determined assessment that is administered to IDEA-eligible students who because of moderate or significant cognitive disabilities cannot meaningfully participate in the HCPSII State Assessment even with accommodations. The Alternate Assessment requires the collection of two independent pieces of evidence using two types of assessment, e.g., observation, interview, record review, performance assessment, student work sample. It was designed to measure "the same HCPS II Reading, Writing, and Mathematics Content Standards that are assessed by the *HCPS II State Assessment*... The HCPS II Benchmarks for Language Arts and Mathematics provide developmentally appropriate knowledge and skills related to each Content Standard and have been grouped by grade level clusters: K-1, 2-3, 4-5, 6-8, 9-12. These HCPS benchmarks have been expanded for the Alternate Assessment to include performances and behaviors at appropriate levels for students with moderate and severe cognitive disabilities, some of whom may require 'access skills' to attain the identified HCPS II Content Standards." (Student Participation Information, p. 121) For reporting and accountability purposes, students taking the Alternate Assessment are included in school summary reports and in determinations of AYP. Alternate Assessment scores are assigned to the "Well Below Proficiency" performance level because the student has not taken "the level of the *HCPS II State Assessment* that is appropriate for the grade level in which he/she is enrolled." (Student Participation Information, p. 126) In 2002, a total of 241 students participated in the state assessment via the Alternate Assessment. That number represents 0.4% of all Hawaii public school students participating in the 2002 assessment.

Students with disabilities are students with an IDEA eligibility flag ("SPED") in the Hawaii Department of Education's statewide Student Information System at the time of the state assessment administration in spring.

See also Critical Element 1.1, "State Accountability System includes every public school and LEA in the State" and Critical Element 2.1, "How does the State Accountability System include all students in the State?"

Reference: State of Hawaii, Department of Education. Office of the Superintendent, Planning & Evaluation Office, Test Development Section. Student Participation Information, April 2003. Honolulu: Hawaii (RS 03-0324)

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.4 How are students with limited English proficiency included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?	<p>All LEP student participate in statewide assessments: general assessments with or without accommodations or a native language version of the general assessment based on grade level standards.</p> <p>State demonstrates that LEP students are fully included in the State Accountability System.</p>	LEP students are not fully included in the State Accountability System.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(5.4)

All English for Second Language Learner (ESLL or “LEP”) students are required to participate in the state assessment. They are allowed to take one or more of the test segments with appropriate accommodations (e.g., extended time) that are based on the student’s identified learning needs, if used during the student’s classroom instruction, recommended by the student’s ESLL teacher and regular classroom teacher, and among those accommodations currently approved by the Department.

The Hawaii Department of Education categorizes ESLL students in three language proficiency levels: Non-English Proficient (**NEP**), Limited English Proficient (**LEP**) and Fluent English Proficient (**FEP**). The levels concur with proficiency levels on sanctioned language proficiency assessments.

For the spring 2002 and 2003 administrations of the *HCPS II State Assessment*, assessment participation requirements for NEP students were, in summary, as follows:

All NEP students were required to participate in the statewide assessment in mathematics. NEP students could be excused from the reading assessment. Upon attaining a LEP level of English proficiency, ESLL students were required to take both the reading and mathematics state assessments (with accommodations, if appropriate). NEP students who did not take the *HCPS II State Assessment*’s reading test were counted as non-participants in the denominator of the participation rate for the state reading assessment.

Upon the recommendation of the U.S. Department of Education’s Peer Review of March 21, 2003, given their review of Hawaii’s draft Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook dated January 31, 2003, the Hawaii Department of Education will henceforth, effective with the 2004 statewide assessment administration, require that all ESLL students, at each and every language proficiency level, be required to take the *HCPS II State Assessment* in both the reading and mathematics. We affirm the principle that all students in the Hawaii public schools should participate in the statewide assessment program.

ESLL students are students with a “SLEP” flag (Students of Limited English Proficiency or SLEP is the term the Hawaii Department of Education formerly used to designate ESLL students and the term is still used in student records) in the statewide Student Information System at the time of the state assessment administration in spring. Only “SLEP” with a type “J” code, meaning “active SLEP,” i.e., eligible and receiving ESLL instructional services, are included in the definition of ESLL (SLEP, type “J”) as used to define the “limited English proficient” subgroup for NCLB state assessment and AYP requirements. Former or “mainstreamed” ESLL students (SLEP, type “M”) are not included in the “limited English proficient” subgroup for NCLB purposes, but rather are included in the general student population.

See also Critical Element 1.1, “State Accountability System includes every public school and LEA in the State” and Critical Element 2.1, “How does the State Accountability System include all students in the State?”

Reference: State of Hawaii, Department of Education. Office of the Superintendent, Planning & Evaluation Office, Test Development Section. Student Participation Information, April 2003. Honolulu: Hawaii (RS 03-0324)

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.5 What is the State's definition of the minimum number of students in a subgroup required for reporting purposes? For accountability purposes?	<p>State defines the number of students required in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes, and applies this definition consistently across the State.⁵</p> <p>Definition of subgroup will result in data that are statistically reliable.</p>	<p>State does not define the required number of students in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes.</p> <p>Definition is not applied consistently across the State.</p> <p>Definition does not result in data that are statistically reliable.</p>

⁵ The minimum number is not required to be the same for reporting and accountability.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(5.5)

The minimum number of students (n-count) required in a subgroup for reporting is 10 to protect student privacy. For accountability purposes (i.e., determining AYP), the minimum number of students is 30 for making inferences about student proficiency and 40 for making inferences about the assessment participation rate. These minimum n-count criteria are applied consistently across the State for reporting and accountability purposes. The identification of 10 students per subgroup for reporting is based on the need to protect the privacy of students when reporting results. See our response to Critical Element 5.6 for additional details regarding the criteria of a minimum n of 10 to protect student privacy.

The State of Hawaii has determined that the minimum number of students in a group required for statistical reliability is 30. This minimum applies to any calculation of a proportion, mean, or statistic that carries with it the implication of a group outcome characteristic (e.g., the percentage of a group demonstrating reading proficiency). This value will maximize statistical reliability in AYP determinations while holding schools accountable for the maximum number of students.

The Hawaii Department of Education is well aware of the complex, interacting issues impacting the accuracy and consistency of AYP determinations. The major issues are sampling error (i.e., accuracy or alpha-level of a test of statistical significance, power, precision, and n-count), measurement error (psychometric quality of the assessment scores), the rigorous demands of the NCLB accountability design itself (e.g., its fully conjunctive use of 37 indicators, the lack of independence between the required subgroups, the use of growth scores as embedded within the safe harbor provision), and basic data processing and reporting quality controls. While the element of n-count affects the reliability and validity of data and decisions, it is only one factor. See also Critical Element 9.1, "How do AYP determinations meet the State's standard for acceptable reliability?"

For the purpose of determining assessment participation rates as an indicator of AYP, the Hawaii Department of Education will use a minimum n-count of 40 students for subgroups. The stringent 95% NCLB-required criterion implies that if subgroup sizes less than 40 are used, no more than one student could miss the test. Even schools that are zealous about maximizing student participation in the state assessment will encounter circumstances that prevent students from taking the test (e.g., extended illness, injury, family issues). Consequently, Hawaii will use a minimum n-count of 40 prior to applying the 95% participation rate standard for subgroups.

References:

Hawaii Department of Education. "Guidelines for Reporting and Interpreting Student Data." August, 2000.

CCSSO (State Collaborative on Comprehensive Assessment Systems for Title I and Accountability Systems and Reporting). Making Valid and Reliable Decisions in Determining Adequate Yearly Progress. December, 2002.

Linn, R., Baker, E. and Herman, J. "Minimum Group Size for Measuring Adequate Yearly Progress" in The CRESST Line. National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing. Fall 2002.

Hill, R. and DePascale, C.A. "Reliability of No Child Left Behind Accountability Designs." The National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment, Inc. February 7, 2003.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.6 How does the State Accountability System protect the privacy of students when reporting results and when determining AYP?	Definition does not reveal personally identifiable information. ⁶	Definition reveals personally identifiable information.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>(5.6)</p> <p>The State of Hawaii has determined the minimum number of students in a cell required for protection of students' privacy as 10. A cell is the unit or subunit for which a count is reported, such as "economically disadvantaged students scoring below proficiency." This minimum applies to any count of information for which privacy is at issue, such as reading proficiency status, by student characteristics, such as ethnicity or special education status. Cells for which the privacy minimum is not met will be blanked in reports of disaggregated data. The determination was made in an administrative directive from the state superintendent on guidelines for disaggregation of student data promulgated in 2000.</p> <p>Additionally, the Department applies a rule ("single-populated level rule") such that no reporting of a subgroup is made publicly if all students within a subgroup perform (or respond, in the case of questionnaire data) to a single value or level on a dependent outcome variable. For example, if all students in a given school, say, from the students with disabilities subgroup, scored in the non-proficient range in reading on the state assessment, then reporting subgroup results for that "single-populated level" would reveal personally identifiable information about each student with membership in that subgroup. Such practice is not allowed.</p> <p>For the situation where the n-count is at least 10 <i>and</i> all values for a subgroup occur in a single level, the technique of limitation of detail by using ranges will be used, for example, reporting "greater than 80% proficient" for the subgroup. This method allows for the maximum amount of information to be reported while still protecting the privacy of individuals.</p> <p>Reference: Hawaii Department of Education. "Guidelines for Reporting and Interpreting Student Data." August, 2000.</p>		

⁶ The Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) prohibits an LEA that receives Federal funds from releasing, without the prior written consent of a student's parents, any personally identifiable information contained in a student's education record.

PRINCIPLE 6. State definition of AYP is based primarily on the State's academic assessments.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
6.1 How is the State's definition of adequate yearly progress based primarily on academic assessments?	<p>Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on assessments.⁷</p> <p>Plan clearly identifies which assessments are included in accountability.</p>	Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on non-academic indicators or indicators other than the State assessments.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>(6.1) The State's AYP decisions are based primarily on the <i>Hawaii Content and Performance Standards (HCPS) II State Assessment</i> in reading and math currently administered in grades 3, 5, 8, and 10. Assessment data are pooled (combined) across grade levels within a school. Of the 37 criteria used to determine AYP, all but one -- the additional academic indicator (i.e., graduation rate for high schools, retention rate for elementary and intermediate or middle schools) -- are based on the state assessment.</p> <p>There are a total of 18 measures for reading:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nine measures corresponding to the percent of students proficient (all students and eight required subgroups: economically disadvantaged; five major ethnic and racial groups; students with disabilities; limited English proficient students) and • Nine additional measures for the percent of students participating in the reading assessment, with a minimum of 95% required, for all students and each of the eight required subgroups. <p>Similarly, a total of 18 measures for mathematics is used in determining AYP.</p>		

⁷ State Assessment System will be reviewed by the Standards and Assessments Peer Review Team.

PRINCIPLE 7. State definition of AYP includes graduation rates for public High schools and an additional indicator selected by the State for public Middle and public Elementary schools (such as attendance rates).

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
7.1 What is the State definition for the public high school graduation rate?	<p>State definition of graduation rate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Calculates the percentage of students, measured from the beginning of the school year, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the state's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or, Uses another more accurate definition that has been approved by the Secretary; and Must avoid counting a dropout as a transfer. <p>Graduation rate is included (in the aggregate) for AYP, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the exception clause⁸ to make AYP.</p>	State definition of public high school graduation rate does not meet these criteria.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

⁸ See USC 6311(b)(2)(I)(i), and 34 C.F.R. 200.20(b)

CRITICAL ELEMENT

as follows:

me ninth grade students who graduate with a diploma within four years, have transferred out of the Hawaii public school system.

me ninth grade students who graduate with a diploma within four years, have transferred out of the school.

graduation rate is the number of first-time ninth grade students from the school-year official enrollment count, excluding students transferring

aduation rate is the number of students receiving a diploma** within four

excludes "dropouts" as defined in the calculation of dropout rates under f Data survey conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics

" is defined as completion of the State of Hawaii approved educational of a BOE or DOE diploma in recognition. Special education students toward a diploma may receive a certificate if they complete the program . Students who receive these IEP completion certificates are not s.

the safe harbor provision), the calculation of the graduation rate will A levels, but not to the subgroup level. Schools and the LEA/SEA that surable objective (threshold) for the graduation rate, as well as those that ove their graduation rate when compared to the previous year, will have for purposes of calculating AYP.

efinition of AYP, schools and the LEA/SEA will be required to meet the ove their graduation rate as a requirement for the safe harbor provision achievement targets but succeed in reducing the proportion of students ten percent). **Graduation rate is included (in the aggregate) for egregated as necessary for use when applying the safe harbor**

posed values for a long-term goal and annual measurable objectives for the Hawaii State Board of Education at their March 6, 2003 meeting and arch.k12.hi.us. Those values are given in the following table.

2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
										90
70	75	75	75	80	80	80	85	85	85	90

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
7.2 What is the State's additional academic indicator for public elementary schools for the definition of AYP? For public middle schools for the definition of AYP?	<p>State defines the additional academic indicators, e.g., additional State or locally administered assessments not included in the State assessment system, grade-to-grade retention rates or attendance rates.⁹</p> <p>An additional academic indicator is included (in the aggregate) for AYP, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the exception clause to make AYP.</p>	State has not defined an additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS
--

⁹ NCLB only lists these indicators as examples.

(7.2)

Retention Rate will be defined as

A. Elementary Schools:

The percentage of students who are proficient in reading at the school's highest grade level is the same as the percentage of students who are proficient in reading at the state's highest grade level in the same school year.

B. Middle, Intermediate, and High Schools:

The percentage of students who are proficient in reading at the school's highest grade (8 or 9) is the same as the percentage of students who are proficient in reading at the state's highest grade (8 or 9) in the same school year.

For purposes of AYP (other than the safe harbor provision), the retention rate will apply to the school and LEA/SEA level. Schools that achieve or exceed the annual measurable objective (through the safe harbor provision) but improve their retention rate, will have met the other academic indicator for purposes of AYP.

In addition to being part of the determination of the retention rate threshold or improvement, schools that fail to meet AYP (subgroups that fail to meet AYP) who are not proficient by at least 30% will be required to determine AYP, and disaggregate the data for the safe harbor provision.

A report of the rationale and proposed retention rate was accepted by the State Board of Education and published on the web at <http://arc.hawaii.gov>

EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

grades 1 through 5 (or 6) whose retention rate is the same as the state's highest grade level in the same school year.

Elementary Schools:

The percentage of students who are proficient in reading at the school's highest grade (8 or 9) is the same as the percentage of students who are proficient in reading at the state's highest grade (8 or 9) in the same school year.

The retention rate will apply to the school and LEA/SEA level. Schools that achieve or exceed the annual measurable objective (through the safe harbor provision) but improve their retention rate, will have met the other academic indicator for purposes of AYP.

SEA will be required to meet the retention rate threshold or improvement for the safe harbor provision. Schools that fail to meet AYP (subgroups that fail to meet AYP) who are not proficient by at least 30% will be required to determine AYP, and disaggregate the data for the safe harbor provision.

A report of the rationale and proposed retention rate was accepted by the State Board of Education and published on the web at <http://arc.hawaii.gov>

Retention Rate (%), Elementary Schools				
Year	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05
Starting Point (Baseline)	3			
Long-term Goal				2
Annual Objective	3	3	3	3

Retention Rate (%), Middle and High Schools				
Year	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05
Starting Point (Baseline)	6			
Long-term Goal				5
Annual Objective	6	6	6	6

Retention Rate (%), Elementary Schools				
Year	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Starting Point (Baseline)				
Long-term Goal				2
Annual Objective	2	2	2	2

Retention Rate (%), Middle and High Schools				
Year	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Starting Point (Baseline)				
Long-term Goal				5
Annual Objective	5	5	5	5

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
7.3 Are the State's academic indicators valid and reliable?	<p>State has defined academic indicators that are valid and reliable.</p> <p>State has defined academic indicators that are consistent with nationally recognized standards, if any.</p>	<p>State has an academic indicator that is not valid and reliable.</p> <p>State has an academic indicator that is not consistent with nationally recognized standards.</p> <p>State has an academic indicator that is not consistent within grade levels.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>(7.3)</p> <p>Reliability and validity are terms properly used in reference to indirect measures, which require inference to connect the measure to an important construct (e.g., test score to reading comprehension), and which involve measurement error, such as students' scores on a test of 30 items sampled from a universe of 10,000 potential questions. Both the graduation rate (used for high schools, and multi-level high/intermediate schools and high/elementary schools) and the retention rate (used for elementary, middle, and intermediate schools) are calculated from counts of all relevant students by status and are <i>ipso facto</i> valid. They are direct calculations of the target rates and require no inference to underlying constructs. The status of students as members of the relevant base group (the denominator of the rate), as graduates, or as having been retained in grade is determined by clear, fixed criteria applied to all students and determined at a fixed date, and is not subject to measurement error. Since the rate is calculated from the universe of relevant students as of fixed dates, the rate for a given school in a given year will not vary with repeated calculation. There is question as to whether these rates will be stable from year to year. That is not a question of reliability, however, but rather of the variability of performance between different cohorts of students. The graduation rate or retention rate in one year is not an estimate of an underlying rate for cohorts in all years. If it were, then, and only then, would reliability be at issue.</p> <p>Our Student Information System captures student data on an individual basis statewide. A unique student identifier provides for accurate association of data to individual students.</p> <p>The State produces academic assessments consistent with the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (AERA, NCME, APA, 1999). The State's contractor for the custom-developed standards-based segments of the <i>HCPS II State Assessment</i> is responsible for researching, documenting and attesting to the reliability and validity of State assessment instruments.</p>		

PRINCIPLE 8. AYP is based on reading/language arts and mathematics achievement objectives.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
8.1 Does the state measure achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics separately for determining AYP?	<p>State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools and LEAs separately measures reading/language arts and mathematics.¹⁰</p> <p>AYP is a separate calculation for reading/language arts and mathematics for each group, public school, and LEA.</p>	State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools and LEAs averages or combines achievement across reading/language arts and mathematics.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>(8.1) The Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) calculation examines separately the proportion of students proficient in reading and mathematics, as well as the rates of participation in the reading and mathematics assessments. In determining whether each subgroup, school, and the LEA/SEA as a whole meets the annual measurable objectives, Hawaii will calculate – separately for reading and for mathematics – the percent of the tested students who achieve the proficient level, examine assessment participation rates, implement a uniform averaging procedure by pooling data across grade levels, and employ the safe harbor provision when applicable.</p> <p>Hawaii has established separate, statewide, annual, measurable objectives in reading and mathematics that identify a minimum percentage of students who must meet the proficient level of academic achievement. The reading and mathematics annual measurable objectives will be applied to each school, to the LEA/SEA, as well as to each subgroup at the school and LEA/SEA levels, to determine AYP status.</p> <p>Consecutive years of failing AYP requirements will be predicated on ANY subgroup of students failing the SAME subject (reading or mathematics) for multiple years. For related details, please see responses to Critical Element 3.2, “How does the State Accountability System determine whether each student subgroup, public school and LEA makes AYP?” and Critical Element 4.1, “How does the State Accountability System make an annual determination of whether each public school and LEA in the State made AYP?”</p>		

¹⁰ If the state has more than one assessment to cover its language arts standards, the State must create a method for including scores from all the relevant assessments.

PRINCIPLE 9. State Accountability System is statistically valid and reliable.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>9.1 How do AYP determinations meet the State's standard for acceptable reliability?</p>	<p>State has defined a method for determining an acceptable level of reliability (decision consistency) for AYP decisions.</p> <p>State provides evidence that decision consistency is (1) within the range deemed acceptable to the State, and (2) meets professional standards and practice.</p> <p>State publicly reports the estimate of decision consistency, and incorporates it appropriately into accountability decisions.</p> <p>State updates analysis and reporting of decision consistency at appropriate intervals.</p>	<p>State does not have an acceptable method for determining reliability (decision consistency) of accountability decisions, e.g., it reports only reliability coefficients for its assessments.</p> <p>State has parameters for acceptable reliability; however, the actual reliability (decision consistency) falls outside those parameters.</p> <p>State's evidence regarding accountability reliability (decision consistency) is not updated.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(9.1)

We know there is a probability of error associated with each subgroup decision (e.g., that a subgroup met or exceeded the target performance specified by an annual measurable objective or not) and that the probability of misidentification error in a conjunctively determined school-wide decision (e.g., that the school made AYP or not) increases as the number of subgroups for which the school is accountable increases. Consistent with the December 2002 report from the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), "Making Valid and Reliable Decisions in Determining Adequate Yearly Progress," we find that there is a tradeoff between increasing the reliability of decisions and including the maximum number of subgroups in the accountability system. Since only those students in the particular grade levels included in the state assessment program contribute academic achievement data, those students constitute a sample when making inferences about subgroups in the school (or the LEA/SEA) as well as when making inferences about the school as a whole (or the entire LEA/SEA). While increasing the minimum sample size or n-count will increase the statistical reliability of inferences made about the subgroup, in the context of NCLB's accountability requirements, doing so will result in a decrease in the number of subgroups available for use in AYP determinations.

Hawaii will use minimum n-counts of 30 for making inferences about student proficiency and 40 for making inferences about assessment participation rate. These minimum n-counts give the best balance between the reliability of decisions and the inclusion of the maximum number of subgroups in the accountability system. (See also Critical Element 5.5, "What is the State's definition of the minimum number of students in a subgroup required for reporting purposes? For accountability purposes?")

Additionally, Hawaii has included several features that are designed to maximize decision consistency and the validity of inferences drawn from the accountability system. These include:

- pooling (combining or "averaging") data across grade levels;
- the use of uniform averaging and comparing the average to the most recent year's results (including the current year), or the current year's results alone, to the annual proficiency target;
- the use of the safe harbor provision, so that schools that miss an annual proficiency target but show a strong gain in the area missed will not be identified; and,
- predating two consecutive years of failing AYP on students failing the same subject (reading or mathematics).

As the new accountability system is implemented, the Hawaii Department of Education will examine annual data related to the consistency of the AYP inferences made about subgroups, schools, and the LEA/SEA. By July 2003, we will form a Technical Advisory Committee comprised of national experts in assessment and accountability and enlist their help in addressing this issue. Additionally, we anticipate that technical assistance from national organizations such as CCSSO may soon become available to assist states in the design and conduct of empirical research and evaluation studies of the decision accuracy and consistency of state accountability systems.

The Hawaii Department of Education will publicly report the method for determining decision consistency, the estimate of decision consistency for the State's AYP determinations, and the acceptable range of decision consistency via the Department's ARCH website and in the State's annual accountability report. The Department will use that information to refine the accountability system.

See also Critical Element 9.2, "What is the State's process for making valid AYP decisions?"

(9.1, continued)

References:

Hawaii Department of Education. "Guidelines for Reporting and Interpreting Student Data." August, 2000.

CCSSO (State Collaborative on Comprehensive Assessment Systems for Title I and Accountability Systems and Reporting). Making Valid and Reliable Decisions in Determining Adequate Yearly Progress. December, 2002.

Linn, R., Baker, E. and Herman, J. "Minimum Group Size for Measuring Adequate Yearly Progress" in The CRESST Line. National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing. Fall 2002.

Hill, R. and DePascale, C.A. "Reliability of No Child Left Behind Accountability Designs." The National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment, Inc. February 7, 2003.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
9.2 What is the State's process for making valid AYP determinations?	State has established a process for public schools and LEAs to appeal an accountability decision.	State does not have a system for handling appeals of accountability decisions.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>(9.2)</p> <p>Hawaii is a single LEA/SEA. Therefore, while the final Title I, Part A, regulations, section 200.31, Opportunity to Review School-Level Data, charges the LEA with the responsibility to create an appeals process, in Hawaii, this responsibility would fall on the “state” office.</p> <p>Opportunity to Review School-Level Data/Appeals (based on the Title I regulations, section 200.31):</p> <p>Before identifying a school for school improvement, corrective action or restructuring, the Superintendent will provide the school with an opportunity to review the school-level data on which the proposed identification is based. All schools will be provided 10 calendar days after the official notification of AYP results to submit an appeal.</p> <p>Step 1: If the principal in consultation with the School/Community-Based Management (SCBM) council believes that the proposed identification is an error for computational or statistical or other substantive reasons, the principal must substantiate and document the perceived errors.</p> <p>Step 2: The principal must submit the supporting evidence to the Superintendent no later than 10 calendar days after the initial notification of AYP results is distributed to the schools.</p> <p>Step 3: The Superintendent considers the evidence submitted by the principal before making a final determination.</p> <p>Step 4: The Superintendent will make public a final determination of the status of the school with respect to identification not later than 30 calendar days after the school is provided with the opportunity to review the data. In other words, a final determination of the status of a school will be made no later than 40 calendar days after the initial notification of AYP results.</p> <p>All decisions on identification after the appeal process has been completed will be final.</p> <p>All efforts to reduce error, including providing due process for the review and appeal of AYP results, contribute to enhancing the validity of AYP determinations. See also our response to Critical Element 9.1, “How do AYP determinations meet the State’s standard for acceptable validity?”</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
9.3 How has the State planned for incorporating into its definition of AYP anticipated changes in assessments?	<p>State has a plan to maintain continuity in AYP decisions necessary for validity through planned assessment changes, and other changes necessary to comply fully with NCLB.¹¹</p> <p>State has a plan for including new public schools in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State has a plan for periodically reviewing its State Accountability System, so that unforeseen changes can be quickly addressed.</p>	<p>State's transition plan interrupts annual determination of AYP.</p> <p>State does not have a plan for handling changes: e.g., to its assessment system, or the addition of new public schools.</p>

¹¹ Several events may occur which necessitate such a plan. For example, (1) the State may need to include additional assessments in grades 3-8 by 2005-2006; (2) the State may revise content and/or academic achievement standards; (3) the State may need to recalculate the starting point with the addition of new assessments; or (4) the State may need to incorporate the graduation rate or other indicators into its State Accountability System. These events may require new calculations of validity and reliability.

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(9.3)

The *HCPS II State Assessment* program will expand to include reading and mathematics assessments in grades 4, 6, and 7 no later than spring 2006 and science assessments at the elementary, middle and high school levels by spring 2008. As the Hawaii Department of Education implements new statewide assessments, we will adjust our definition of Adequate Yearly Progress so that we incorporate data from the new grade levels tested while maintaining the timeline for all students to reach proficiency by 2013-14.

Preliminary plans include:

1. Developing draft performance levels for the grade 4, 6, and 7 assessments using the same item-mapping ("bookmark") methodology use previously for the current assessments in grades 3, 5, 8, and 10.
2. Developing recommended performance levels for the new assessments by adjusting the draft performance levels such that (a) the impact or difficulty of the assessment/educational challenge is equalized across grade levels and, concurrently, (b) grade-to-grade consistency in the underlying scaled score metric is maintained.
3. Deriving the baseline percent proficient on the new assessments will parallel the process used to establish the 2001-02 starting points. (Please see our response to Critical Element 3.1, "How does the State's definition of adequate yearly progress require all students to be proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by the 2013-2014 school year?" and Critical Element 3.2a, "What is the State's starting point for calculating Adequate Yearly Progress?") The baseline percents proficient from the new assessments will be averaged with the prior baseline values to determine "reset" baseline values.
4. Resetting the remaining intermediate goals and annual measurable objectives, given the reset starting points, using the rationale for the processes previously used (i.e., the activities described in Critical Elements 3.2, 3.2a, 3.2b, and 3.2c).
5. Requesting approval by the Hawaii State Board of Education of the recommended performance levels for the new assessments and of the proposed reset intermediate goals and annual measurable objectives. This step also affords interested stakeholders and the public an opportunity for review and input regarding the proposed changes.

Hawaii's Technical Advisory Committee will be requested to assist in ratifying and/or developing recommendations for improving the preliminary plan.

Students who attend a new school will be accounted for in the first year of the school's operation by including those students' scores into the AYP determination for the LEA/SEA. The goal of 100% proficiency for all students will remain consistent with the 2013-14 timeline. Adequate yearly progress determinations for new schools will begin with their second year of operation and students attending the new school will be included in determinations of AYP for the school.

The accountability plans for Colorado, Kansas, and Ohio, all of which contain similar language regarding new schools, have been approved by the USDOE. Hawaii, therefore, assumes it may do the same.

PRINCIPLE 10. In order for a public school or LEA to make AYP, the State ensures that it assessed at least 95% of the students enrolled in each subgroup.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
10.1 What is the State's method for calculating participation rates in the State assessments for use in AYP determinations?	<p>State has a procedure to determine the number of absent or untested students (by subgroup and aggregate).</p> <p>State has a procedure to determine the denominator (total enrollment) for the 95% calculation (by subgroup and aggregate).</p> <p>Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for reaching the 95% assessed goal.</p>	<p>The state does not have a procedure for determining the rate of students participating in statewide assessments.</p> <p>Public schools and LEAs are not held accountable for testing at least 95% of their students.</p>

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

(10.1)

Our statewide Student Information System and use of a unique student identifier allow for accurate student accounting and tracking. The Evaluation Section of the Hawaii Department of Education will perform the calculation of participation rates on the state assessments. These calculations will be done from a complete student roster file that identifies each student in the state who is enrolled at the time of testing. Additionally, each school is responsible for providing documentation to the Test Development Section of the Hawaii Department of Education for each student who was not tested. The Department compares the number of students in test scores files with official enrollment counts and such audits must show that all students are tested or otherwise accounted for.

As previously noted in Critical Element 2.1 ("How does the State's Accountability System include all students in the State?"):

Beginning in 2003 all students enrolled at the time of testing are expected to participate in *HCPS II State Assessment*. The first Monday in the month of March will be used as a fixed census date for determining the specific students for whom a given school is responsible in terms of ensuring participation in the state assessment. That census will operationally define "enrolled at the time of testing" and will comprise the denominator of the assessment participation rate measure used in determining AYP for the state, for schools, and for all required student subgroups. (See Critical Elements 2.2 and 2.3 for related details.)

Participation rates are computed as:

The number of students tested divided by the number of student enrolled at the time of test administration.

One modification to the preceding calculation rule is necessary in order to account completely and appropriately per school for students who transfer during the assessment window. That is, for any student who transfers from another Hawaii public school after the start of the assessment window, the school to which the student transferred (receiving school) is to send any completed assessment response booklet(s) to the student's previous (sending) school. For NCLB assessment and accountability purposes, such transferring students are attributed to the sending school at which the student was initially "enrolled at the time of testing."

Students who exit the Hawaii public schools prior to taking any part of the state assessment, which may occur if a student exits the system between the first date of the State's official assessment window and a somewhat later school-scheduled opening of the testing window, are not part of the number of students "enrolled at the time of testing" for the purpose of calculated assessment participation rates.

Participation rates will be calculated for all schools and for the LEA/SEA and for all subgroups for which the number of students meets the state standard of 40 for the statistical reliability of participation rates. The participation rate will not be calculated if there is an insufficient number in the group for statistical reliability.

In accordance with the provisions of NCLB law and regulations, failure of a school to test 95% of its students or the students in any target subgroup for which there is a number sufficient for statistical reliability will result in the school's being identified as failing to make Adequate Yearly Progress.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
10.2 What is the State's policy for determining when the 95% assessed requirement should be applied?	State has a policy that implements the regulation regarding the use of 95% allowance when the group is statistically significant according to State rules.	State does not have a procedure for making this determination.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>(10.2)</p> <p>The procedure for calculating participation rates is explained in Critical Element 10.1. The participation rate is included as a requirement for AYP for any group for which the number of students enrolled in the school meets or exceeds the minimum n-count for participation rate (see also Critical Element 5.5).</p>		

Appendix A

Required Data Elements for State Report Card

1111(h)(1)(C)

1. Information, in the aggregate, on student achievement at each proficiency level on the State academic assessments (disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged, except that such disaggregation shall not be required in a case in which the number of students in a category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.
2. Information that provides a comparison between the actual achievement levels of each student subgroup and the State's annual measurable objectives for each such group of students on each of the academic assessments.
3. The percentage of students not tested (disaggregated by the student subgroups), except that such disaggregation shall not be required in a case in which the number of students in a category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.
4. The most recent 2-year trend in student achievement in each subject area, and for each grade level, for the required assessments.
5. Aggregate information on any other indicators used by the State to determine the Adequate Yearly Progress of students in achieving State academic achievement standards disaggregated by student subgroups.
6. Graduation rates for secondary school students disaggregated by student subgroups.
7. Information on the performance of local educational agencies in the State regarding making adequate yearly progress, including the number and names of each school identified for school improvement under section 1116.
8. The professional qualifications of teachers in the State, the percentage of such teachers teaching with emergency or provisional credentials, and the percentage of classes in the State not taught by highly qualified teachers, in the aggregate and disaggregated by high-poverty compared to low-poverty schools which (for this purpose) means schools in the top quartile of poverty and the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.